

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1-5 have been amended and claim 6 has been newly added. It is submitted that no new matter has been added.

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, further consideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Summary of the Interview

The Applicant would like to thank Examiners Jeong Park and Ashokkumar Patel for conducting a personal interview with the Applicant's representatives on December 6, 2007 at the United States Patent & Trademark Office.

During the interview, it was explained to the Examiner that the Chang et al. reference (US Published Application No. 2002/0178261) does not disclose sequentially receiving divided information blocks obtained by dividing a file and that the divided information blocks received first are selected to be output. In response, the Examiner pointed to Figure 5 of the Chang et al. reference and asserted that Figure 5 shows dividing information and receiving the divided information from multiple servers.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the title as not being descriptive. Applicant has amended the title to be descriptive. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the title.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 1-5 and required correction for a clear understanding of the claims as mentioned in paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action. By this amendment, claims 1, 2 and 5 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the aforementioned objection is rendered moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for insufficient antecedent basis as mentioned in paragraph 4 on page 2 of the Office Action. By this amendment, claim 3 has been amended so as to now be dependent from independent claim 2. Accordingly, it is submitted that the aforementioned rejection has been rendered moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2002/0178261 (Chang et al.) in view of U.S. 2002/0143888 (Lisiecki et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's aforementioned rejection and submits that the prior art references fail to disclose or suggest sequentially receiving divided information blocks obtained by dividing the file and transmitted from multiple storage apparatuses, each of the divided information blocks are received from each of the multiple storage apparatuses, as recited in amended independent claim 1 of the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that the Chang et al. reference does not disclose receiving divided information blocks obtained by dividing a file and transmitted from multiple storage apparatuses where each of the divided information blocks are received from each of the multiple storage apparatuses. Instead, as shown in Figure 5, the Chang et al. reference discloses that a first packet is received from server 1 and a second packet is received from server 2. The Chang et al. reference does not disclose that each of the packets is received from each of the servers as recited in amended claim 1. Further, the Chang et al. reference discloses that a plurality of simultaneous downloads are started from the plurality of servers. When it is determined that one of the plurality of servers has received a complete file, the rest of the downloads are terminated. (See paragraph [0030] of Chang et al.) Accordingly, the system disclosed in the Chang et al. reference would not receive each of the divided information blocks from each of the multiple storage apparatuses, as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Lisiecki et al. fails to teach or suggest the claimed features missing from Chang et al.

It is noted that the aforementioned features recited in independent claim 1 are similarly

recited in independent claims 4 and 6.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that each of independent claims 1, 4 and 6, as well as the claims dependent thereon, is clearly allowable and the Examiner is kindly requested to promptly pass this case to issuance.

Claims 2, 3 and 5 are allowable based on their dependency on claims 1 and 4.

In the event, however, that the Examiner has any comments or suggestion of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the Applicant's representatives to expedite allowance of this application.

Conclusion

Insofar as the Examiner's objections and rejections have been fully addressed, the instant application, including claims 1-6 is in condition for allowance and Notice of Allowability of claims 1-6 is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

HIDEAKI ISHIMATSU

January 3, 2008
(Date)

By

LOUIS SICKLES II

Registration No. 45,803

PANITCH SCHWARZE BELISARIO & NADEL LLP

One Commerce Square

2005 Market Street, Suite 2200

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013

Telephone: 215-965-1200

Direct Dial: 215-965-1294

Facsimile: 215-965-1210

E-Mail: lsickles@panitchlaw.com

LS/